



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,417	03/12/2004	Paul A. Krieg	20825-0004	6904

7590 02/23/2010
Kathryn H. Wade, Ph.D.
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
999 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30309-3996

EXAMINER

BRISTOL, LYNN ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1643

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/23/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/799,417	Applicant(s) KRIEG, PAUL A.	
	Examiner LYNN BRISTOL	Art Unit 1643	

All Participants:

(1) LYNN BRISTOL.

(2) Wm Warren.

Date of Interview: 19 February 2010

Status of Application: final

(3) Alan Robins.

(4) _____.

Time: 9:30 AM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 1st enablement and written description; ODP

Claims discussed:

1-13, 21-26 and 28-30

Prior art documents discussed:

not applicable

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Lynn Bristol/
Primary Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner will drop ODP rejection in view of abandoned conflicting application; discussed draft claim 1 from 2/5/10 vis-à-vis scope for in vitro and in vivo method and where no support for functionalized antibody for instant Claims 2-4; unclear what epitope is for ab208 and ab210 so unclear if antibody binds peptides of SEQ ID NOS: 1, 2, 3 and 5 of Claims 8-11 and 12; language for "biological sample" wrt practicing the method in vivo in a patient is awkward and could be amended to clarify an in vitro method from an in vivo method in a patient having the angiogenesis-related disorder and in need thereof. .